

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA
NORTHERN DIVISION

DR. JOE L. REED,

Plaintiffs,

V.

BOB RILEY, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:07-cv-190-WKW

ORDER

Plaintiff is correct in his assertion that leave is not required to file his First Amended Complaint. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a); *Williams v. Bd. of Regents of the Univ. Sys. of Ga.*, 477 F.3d 1282, 1291 (11th Cir. 2007). The portion of the court's June 6, 2007 order directing the plaintiff to file a motion for leave is VACATED, and the Motion for Leave to File First Amended Complaint (Doc. # 14) is DENIED as MOOT. The defendants shall answer or otherwise respond to the First Amended Complaint **on or before June 25, 2007**, and shall respond to the plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. # 16) in accordance with the April 30, 2007 briefing order.

SO ORDERED.

DONE this 21st day of June, 2007.

/s/ W. Keith Watkins
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE